

COLLEGE ART JOURNAL

PUBLISHED BY THE COLLEGE ART ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

MARCH, 1942

VOLUME 1

NUMBER 3

The Direct Approach in the Study of Art History

SIRARPIE DER NERSESSIAN 54

Modern Art First, not Last

LAURENCE SCHMECKEBIER 60

In Defense of Modern Art as a Field for Research

JAMES THRALL SOBY 63

Report of the Thirtieth Annual Meeting

65

Report of the Business Meeting of Members

75

News Reports

76

Book Reviews: Karl Nierendorf, *Paul Klee* (ALFRED NEU-MEYER); José Gudiol i Ricart, *Goya* (HAROLD E. WETHEY); Ludwig Goldscheider, *Donatello* (H. W. JANSON); Kimon Nicolaïdes, *The Natural Way to Draw* (RAYMOND BAXTER DOWDEN)

78

Books Received

82

Microfilms: *American Indian Art Exhibit*

82

Announcement to Members

SUMNER MCK. CROSBY 83

EDITOR: Myrtilla Avery, 425 West 23rd Street, New York City

ASSISTANT EDITOR: W. L. M. Burke, McCormick Hall, Princeton, N.J.

EDITOR FOR BOOK REVIEWS: A. C. Ritchie, Frick Collection, 1 East 70th Street, New York City

Books for review should be sent to the Editor for Book Reviews. Articles, news notes, etc., should be submitted to the Assistant Editor.

The COLLEGE ART JOURNAL is published four times a year: November, January, March and May by the College Art Association of America at 625 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. One dollar a year; single numbers twenty-five cents. Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office in New York, N.Y., under the act of March 3, 1879. Additional entry at Menasha, Wisconsin.

THE DIRECT APPROACH IN THE STUDY OF ART HISTORY¹

BY SIRARPIE DER NERSESSIAN

THE opening sentences of M. Focillon's book on the art of the Romanesque sculptors may be applied to the study of all periods of art history. "*L'étude de la sculpture médiévale en Occident peut être prise de plusieurs points de vue et, pour bien la comprendre dans son ensemble, il faudrait n'en négliger aucun. . . . La science qui en rendrait compte d'une façon complète devrait être à la fois une iconographie, une philosophie et une analyse formelle.*" Each one of these approaches—iconography, philosophy, analysis of forms—requires a special type of knowledge, a special type of preparation and in different studies one or the other has been emphasized or considered exclusively. But whatever the point of view, this fact remains, that the ideas are expressed through the language of art; and in order to get their full meaning one must learn that language. The study of art forms is thus the foundation of art history and the first task is to recognize and understand the essential elements of a work of art.

The methods used in training students in the study of art history are varied. The one most frequently followed might be called the external approach: the work of art is viewed "from the outside," in its final aspect. Through careful consideration of an individual work, through minute comparisons with other works by the same man, or of the same period, or of the national or regional group to which the artist belongs, one tries to determine the style of that artist, the characteristic traits of the art of a period or of a country. Another method, which may be called the direct approach, is based on the recognition of the fact that style and technique are inseparable. Its aim is to supplement the information acquired through the external study of works of art by the immediate knowledge of the technical elements which are responsible for the distinguishing features of the style.

¹ Paper presented at the Thirtieth Annual Meeting of the College Art Association at New Haven, January 23rd, 1942. The publication of the complete text of this paper should not be construed as setting a precedent for the inclusion of long articles in the JOURNAL. A wide-spread popular demand as well as the desire of the Directors of the Association to give evidence of their sincere interest in this and similar approaches to art instruction, have influenced the Editors to make an exception.—Sumner McK. Crosby.

In many colleges and universities, painting and modeling were taught long before the introduction of a serious study of art history. When departments of art history were established, these courses of painting, modeling and design were usually maintained, sometimes as a separate unit, sometimes incorporated into the general program of art history. This has brought about a certain confusion; in the minds of many persons any kind of practical work is a survival of an old order which may have its historical *raison d'être* but which does not have a legitimate place in the study of art history. A very clear distinction should be made, therefore, between those courses which are entirely devoted to the practice of the arts and are similar to the work done in art schools, and those courses in which the practical work is closely connected with art history. An attempt has been made at Wellesley to bring out this distinction by calling the former studio courses, and by giving the name "laboratory" to that type of practical work which is allied to the teaching of art history. Only the latter concerns us here.

The direct approach, this method of combining practical and theoretical studies, was initiated at Wellesley in 1897 by Alice Van Vechten Brown; it was developed first under her direction, later under that of Myrtille Avery, and is now being continued. In the long period of time—over forty years—in which it has been practiced, details of the plan have been and are still being constantly modified or adjusted, and there has been ample opportunity to examine its possible advantages or disadvantages. Since this method was firmly established when I came to Wellesley, and I can in no way claim any credit for it, I am free to say, without being deterred by personal modesty, that the results have fully justified the experiment and have given us the conviction that it is not only a good method but the right method of teaching undergraduates.

The function of technique in the development or changes of style is fully recognized in architecture and in the various works of minor arts such as ceramics, textiles, metalwork. Nor is there much doubt about the advantages of a knowledge of techniques in certain specific fields or periods. No one will deny, for instance, that experiments with the different methods employed in the graphic arts are of invaluable help in appreciating critically, let us say, a drypoint as distinguished from an etching, or a pencil drawing from a silverpoint. A student trained in this manner will know from first hand experience the possibilities and limitations of each medium and he will have a more intelligent appreciation of the results. Similarly, a

person who has tried his hand at different kinds of fresco, who has experimented with mosaics, tempera, oil glazes, will have a more solid foundation for his judgment of medieval and Renaissance painting. Erroneous attributions may be avoided if one is able to recognize fundamental technical differences which may exist between works ascribed to the same artist. Or if any injury has been done to a work of art in the process of restoration, as is often the case, a person with some technical knowledge is in a better position to recognize the condition and to judge the original aspect of the work in question. I need only recall one of the examples mentioned by Daniel V. Thompson in his important book on *The Materials of Medieval Painting*. Years ago, the Russian copyist, Nicholas Lochoff, asserted that the blackness of the Tintoretto paintings in the Scuola di San Rocco was due to the effect of oil or varnish applied by a later hand on colors tempered with size. Very few were willing to accept his statement that these paintings were originally executed in a color scheme of light grays, blues, reds, greens and yellows. Yet when they were taken down from the walls during the last war, it was discovered that the portion of one of the canvases which had been folded under and, consequently, had never been varnished, showed exactly the color and high value range claimed by Lochoff.

The knowledge of different techniques is only one aspect of the direct method and may be reserved, in a large measure, for the more advanced and specialized courses. The real training must begin as soon as the student is introduced to the study of art, so that he may learn to recognize, through his personal experience and by means of a series of exercises, the fundamental problems connected with line, form, color, design. Thus the understanding of a work of art will be based on firmer ground, the student's faculties of observation, of analysis, will develop more quickly, he will tend to rely less exclusively on what he hears or reads and more on what he sees for himself.

In order that such a method of teaching may be carried out successfully, it is imperative that the art history be taught by a person trained in that field and the practical experiments by another instructor who has been equally well trained in an art school and who has also some knowledge of art history. There should be close collaboration between the two instructors, and what we have called the laboratory work should be subordinated to the historical and critical study. That is, the principal aim should be not to train future artists, but rather to acquaint students as directly as possible with the

purely formal aspects. The artistic quality of the student's own work is far less important in this case than his intelligent understanding of the problems involved and a person with no skill at all may derive as much benefit from these exercises as his more gifted companions. It is also advisable to plan the work in such a way that there is as close a parallelism as possible between the type of exercises done in the laboratory appointment and the monuments discussed in the lectures. A few examples will illustrate these points. To draw the student's attention to the degree of stylization of the human figure in certain works of ancient art, the instructor poses a model in the attitude of one of the figures which is being studied, for instance, the boy gathering crocuses from Knossos, or one of the hockey players on the relief from an ancient wall in Athens, or one of the figures from the Aegina pediment. By sketching first from the living model, then from a photograph of the painting, relief or statue projected on the screen, the students readily observe the type of stylization of anatomy in each case. For the study of Greek drapery, similar sketches may be made from a model clothed in the Doric peplos and a slide of a figure from the East pediment of Olympia.

Experiments in light and shade and in color accompany the study of painting. It is well to begin with very elementary problems. In order to teach students to distinguish half tone and shadow without being distracted by differences of local color, the instructor may take simple geometric forms, paint them with varicolored spots or graded tones, and then ask the class to draw and shade these objects, ignoring the local color. Gradually one may pass to more complicated forms, to still lifes and to figures. During these and similar exercises dealing with the management of light and shade, constant allusion is made to the works which are being studied in the lectures, so that students come to understand more easily, the various styles of painting.

Through his own use of color the student will have an immediate knowledge of the properties of color and of the importance of color relations. Simple exercises in monochrome oil painting, which have as their main object the expression of form, lead to similar studies in full color. Other exercises show the possibilities of producing solid form without adherence to the "total visual effect," that is, without following the sequence of light and shade values, diminution of intensity, etc., which occur under ordinary illumination. This enables students to understand specific aspects of the work of the early Renaissance artists whose color modeling is of that type.

By means of other exercises, they are helped to recognize the contrast between those paintings in which there is an organization of tones with reference to a definite source of light, as in Vermeer, and those in which light and shade are managed for dramatic effect as in Tintoretto. Outdoor studies, in which attention is directed to the cooling off of color and the softening of edges in the distance, may help in grasping the principles of aerial perspective. The experience of painting in broken color, both still life and landscape, brings out more clearly the distinction between pigment mixture and the mixture of colors by the eye.

Exercises connected with sculpture present some material difficulties, since it is seldom possible to experiment with actual stone carving, but substitutes may be found and by using fairly hard synthetic materials and small carving tools, students may have some opportunity to distinguish between the cutting away process and the building up process with which they are familiar through their use of clay. Most beginners find it difficult to distinguish between the different planes of a modeled surface. One way of helping them is to ask them to make a clay abstract, in simplified planes, of a fully modeled cast. And since so much of our work is dependent on the study of photographs rather than on that of the originals, it is very important to train students to visualize the relief. For instance, by working from details of such an example as the Ghiberti doors they can deduce the degree of projection. By using different views they can reconstruct the three dimensions not only of reliefs but of statues in the round.

Similar, though usually more difficult, exercises are assigned in many of the advanced courses where a closer connection may be established between the historical study and the practical work. As an example, I may cite a problem in connection with the study of Michelangelo. A model was made to take the pose of one of the youths from the Sistine ceiling; we had to try several times before we could find a pose which could be reproduced fairly closely by the human body, and this in itself was instructive. On the same sheet the students made a drawing from the model and a sketch from the photograph of the youth from the Sistine ceiling. Sometimes original compositions are made as far as possible in the style of an artist, of a school, or of a period. One such experiment, which has particularly interested students in recent years, has been to illustrate an idyll of Theocritus, by making a composition in clay in the manner of late Hellenistic pictorial reliefs.

These are only a few of the exercises given to students. Others concern architecture, others again are devoted to the analysis of composition, but I hope the ones I have mentioned are sufficient to show the special character of the laboratory work and its general aim which is the understanding of style and of technique. Perhaps the best comparison of this method would be with the study of Musical Theory. The studio work, that is the study of painting, modeling, design, independent of art history, may be compared in part to instruction in piano, violin or some other instrument. What we have called "laboratory" work, that is the practical exercises, closely allied with the art history, is similar to the study of harmony. It is obvious that a knowledge of the principles of harmony and exercises in composition are essential to anyone who wishes to make a serious study of music. That the parallel case in the field of fine arts is not generally recognized is due to the fact that we are dealing with the same materials both in studio and in laboratory. Thus the purpose of the instruction in these courses seems to be the same to those who do not pay attention to the fundamental difference of the approach and of the type of work.

One objection raised against this method of teaching art history is the supposed loss of time. I have often heard it said, "Of course we should be very glad to have our students know more about technique, etc., but if we devoted one appointment a week out of the usual three, we should not be able to cover the field." The extent of the "field" that has to be covered is not easy to define. The subject with which we are all concerned is so difficult and so vast that even a lifetime of study in a restricted field cannot give to any of us that complete knowledge which is our distant goal. We are naturally more modest when we refer to the field of study in our teaching, but even there, with the flexibility of the programs, with the range between the number of hours that students may devote to their major subject, there cannot be any set norm. I realize of course that in referring to the field we are thinking of the minimum amount of information that a student must have, first in a given course, then in a given number of courses, which constitute the minimum requirement for an undergraduate in his major field. But even the concept of the minimum requirement would differ from one qualified person to another, from one well-established program to another. The problem must be approached from another side, and, to my mind, it may be formulated in terms of information versus knowledge. Is the aim of an undergraduate program in a liberal arts col-

lege to give as much information as can be crowded into a four year program? If that were the case, naturally more information could be acquired in three hours of lectures than in two hours. But none of us would accept such a definition; we should all say that our aim is to train, to the best of our ability, the student's mind, his powers of observation, of analysis, of criticism, of independent judgment, to lay the proper foundations for more advanced work, to give, in brief, adequate knowledge rather than extended information. The question of time is therefore subsidiary; the real question is, does a student acquire a better knowledge, a truer understanding of art through three hours of lectures, or their equivalent, or is this more surely achieved if theoretical knowledge is supplemented by the proper kind of practical knowledge? It is our belief that the time devoted to the type of practical work I have described is a gain and not a loss, that it assures a better, quicker, more intimate understanding of works of art and a greater ability to distinguish delicate variations of style.

The method I have briefly sketched applies primarily to undergraduate work. Having acquired the necessary technical and basic knowledge, the student need not necessarily continue the practical work in post graduate studies, except when he devotes his time to a special field in which further experiments in technique may be important. But in so far as this method of training lays a firm foundation for independent studies it has a direct bearing on sound methods of research.

Wellesley College

MODERN ART FIRST, NOT LAST

BY LAURENCE SCHMECKEBIER

IN THE exchange of views on the historical value of modern art recently published in the *COLLEGE ART JOURNAL* by Mr. Barr and Professor Mather, I should like to add a few observations which are based on experience perhaps somewhat different from theirs. Professor Mather is probably right, speaking for students of the humanities, in insisting that the most scholarly discipline and the surest values are to be found in the historical past. But I think a good many of our colleagues in the teaching profession are likely

to ask, where *are* the students of the humanities? In these days there has been much discussion by prominent educators as to the necessity of humanistic studies in undergraduate curricula, but I have been able to observe little real action in this direction by the students themselves. Fifteen years ago the most brilliant students of my undergraduate class in one of the larger midwestern universities were majors in the humanities. Since that time student values have been badly jolted. They are no less interested in the humanities, but they have been compelled by political and economic circumstances to think first of training themselves in a specific profession, not only to make a living but also to make themselves materially useful to society. Their interest in the arts, modern and historical, has grown both in extent and earnestness and is based, I should say, on a new set of values that are intimately bound up with the creative necessities of modern life.

The problem may be different in the privately endowed colleges with smaller and more restricted enrollments, but in the universities which I have been able to observe, that professional-mindedness of the undergraduate majority is not only a fact but is one of the greatest assets for which the art historian could wish. Thanks to the magnificent job our museums, the radio and the press have done by way of public education in the arts, our task is no longer one of elementary appreciation. Rather it is one of presenting factual information, critical analysis and the functional relationship of the arts as they exist or have existed in the social structure. With a heterogeneous class made up of professional students in architecture, industrial design, engineering, education and—what is now becoming more common in universities, creative sculpture and painting—one is faced with the difficult task of bridging the gap between these specialized disciplines and the broader, more fundamental aspects of aesthetic values and our cultural heritage. I think it is safe to say that where a student's professional and creative interests lie you will get his best work and that the extension of the highest level of achievement to the individual's entire intellectual and spiritual life is one of the goals which the humanistic discipline seeks to attain. To bridge this gap between the professional and the aesthetic-historical training of the student is to achieve both a personal enrichment and an emotional stabilization of which the professionally minded scholar today is sorely in need.

I find it difficult to disagree with either Mr. Barr or Professor Mather. A documented history of modern artists is much easier to

write twenty years after they are dead; they will not change their minds or talk back. But on the other hand, as teachers, historians or critics, we cannot escape the modern artist and the problems that confront him. Our judgment and our vision are closely related, and the convenient refuge sought by the scholar in the relative certainty of the historical past is no more justifiable than that taken in the "permanent beauty" of the historical style by artists of an earlier generation. No; conditions make it imperative that modern art be faced first. The problems are difficult and confusing, but if they are once grasped the student is better equipped to comprehend the great problems of the past. As a student of art history at the University of Munich the technical analysis which I learned in Max Doerner's class in *Malmaterial* at the nearby Academy, based as it was on his own creative experience, was as valuable to me as the historical research of the photographic archives. It seems to me, also, that Robert Oertel's reliance on modern technical methods brought him closer to a solution of the much worked Masaccio-Masolino problem than most of his historically-minded competitors.¹

There is a great deal of fear on the part of many of us that the emphasis on modern art might "confuse" the student by opening up problems for which there are no answers at the back of the book. The mediocre student obviously will be confused, but he will be just as confused by the problems of Pedro Berruguete or Joos van Ghent as he will by those of Picasso and Orozco. The real student will take the confusion as a challenge and see it through to solution regardless of whether it has historical dignity or not. I have the impression that the undergraduate student of art today knows what he is doing and why, far better than he did fifteen years ago. A greater majority of them are self-supporting; that earnestness is infectious and stimulating. Give them a start with the problems of the modern artist, which belong to them as much as to the creative artist, and the student will go back to the Old Masters with a clearer understanding of both problem and solution. Furthermore he will have a keener sensitivity for the even less tangible forces that brought them into being.

I should like also to supplement Miss Wilder's appeal made in the first issue of the *COLLEGE ART JOURNAL* for pioneers in the art historical research of Latin America. Whether the field is modern,

¹ R. Oertel, "Die Frühwerke des Masaccio," *Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft*, VII, 1933, 191.

R. Oertel, "Masaccio und die Geschichte der Freskotechnik," *Jahrbuch der Preussischen Kunstsammlungen*, LV, 1934, 229.

colonial or ancient art, it is everything she claims: rich, fascinating, rewarding. But it is something more; it is uniquely challenging as no other field in the history of art. It cannot be judged by the traditional aesthetic standards in which we of the United States have been trained, but by myriad complex and varied values and circumstances that are distinctly autonomous and unique. The challenge is not merely one of appreciation but of fundamental understanding which if it were achieved, I have been told by many a Latin American scholar, would establish a cultural solidarity throughout the Americas, as firm as that of our own United States.

University of Minnesota

IN DEFENSE OF MODERN ART AS A FIELD FOR RESEARCH

BY JAMES THRALL SOBY

PROFESSOR Frank Jewett Mather, Jr. begins his recent article, "Old Art or New,"¹ by declaring his sympathy with Alfred H. Barr's theory that the art of our own time constitutes a central problem for students and historians in the Fine Arts. Professor Mather then goes on to reveal that his sympathy is emphatically one of heart rather than mind, for he follows his declaration with a refutation of Mr. Barr's whole premise. I have just read Professor Mather's argument with the intense concentration which comes for the reader only from a continuous disagreement with what he is reading. And I should like here to outline the terms of my disagreement on behalf of those who, like Mr. Barr and myself, feel that contemporary art is a fertile but sadly untended field for research.

To begin with, Professor Mather defends his own former practice of limiting his course on modern art to two or three lectures coming at the end of a long series of lectures on past art. He avers that in so doing he was giving twentieth-century painting "its relative importance in the splendid succession from Rubens and Caravaggio to Renoir and Eakins." The trouble here is with the word "relative." If Professor Mather means to say that the past has produced more, and *in toto* greater, art than the present, no one will dispute his

¹ In *COLLEGE ART JOURNAL*, I, 2, p. 31-33, written in reply to Alfred H. Barr, Jr.'s article, "Modern Art Makes History, Too," in the first number of the *JOURNAL*.

point. But his system of measuring leaves out of account what Mr. Barr calls a "simple, obvious and overwhelming fact," that contemporary art has a particular importance for us because it is being created in the era to which we ourselves belong. It affects our thought, emotion and vision with a directness which past art cannot possibly have for us. And if each century neglects its own art in favor of that of earlier centuries, when is art history to catch up with itself? Or is it to circle endlessly, like a dog with its tail in its mouth, oblivious to the sound and light of its own hour?

Professor Mather goes on to say that it is impossible to be right or wrong about contemporary painters but relatively simple to be right or wrong about past artists. He adds a list of past painters upon whom, according to him, more or less final judgment has been passed. The list includes Duccio, Giotto, Masaccio, Raphael, Michelangelo, Titian, Rubens, Rembrandt, Velasquez, Hogarth, David, Ingres, Delacroix, Courbet, Manet, Monet and Cézanne. But how final is this judgment? David the Classicist is currently being reappraised by serious students as a progenitor of nineteenth century Romantic art. Courbet the Realist has been called "more Romantic than Delacroix" by one of the greatest modern artists, and Cézanne has been dismissed as a "platonic mason" by one of the most famous. Delacroix's reputation is in good part sustained by his *Journal*, a book full of that first-hand documentation on contemporary art of which Professor Mather disapproves in principle. Of course, as Professor Mather himself makes clear, to reappraise an artist is not necessarily to alter appreciably the esteem with which he is regarded. Yet at least one artist on his list, Claude Monet, having sat in the Hall of Fame for the forty-year span which Professor Mather says entitles any artist to a permanent seat, has lately been sent to an anteroom to eat by himself and may presently be banished from the premises altogether. On the other hand, Picasso, who has sat there a little less than the requisite forty years, is more and more frequently being asked to sit at the head table.

The truth is that there is seldom such a thing as absolute and final fame, though there is certainly and lamentably such a thing as star-billing, which goes on with very little change in typography from one generation of critics to the next. Each century or half-century must discover and exploit its own heroes, but whether these heroes are living or dead is surely a minor consideration in the mythology of vital human thought. Because Meier-Graefe's voyage to Spain made El Greco one of the great figures for modern taste, is no

indication that Greco's fame will not some day be eclipsed by a mannerist artist as yet unborn.

Professor Mather finally dismisses criticism of contemporary art as an indoor sport, "fascinating" but "extra-hazardous." One gathers that he would prefer the students and historians of each century to keep fairly quiet about the art of their time, leaving problems of collation and scholarship to succeeding generations. But think how profoundly our knowledge of Renaissance painting depends on Vasari, how gravely we need additions to the few contemporary accounts which supplement Vasari's book. And what is the final source of information about a given artist but the artist himself? The artist is of course an authority who must be checked as carefully as any other, but in the last analysis only the artist can supply the primary information about himself, his aims and ambitions, upon which all art criticism is based, directly or indirectly. Professor Mather shudders to think what one of his students might learn from pumping Mr. Marin, Mr. Benton, or Mr. Dali. To this I can only reply that I have spent a good deal of time pumping one of these three artists, and that in so doing I have learned facts about the painter which I could not possibly have learned in another way. These facts seem to me valuable. They are in any case facts bearing upon the art of our own century, the century of all centuries which we who live in it must, in Mr. Barr's words, study, understand, enjoy and master.

Farmington, Connecticut

REPORT OF THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE COLLEGE ART ASSOCIATION AT NEW HAVEN, JANUARY 23-24, 1942

A few changes in the program as published in the last number of the JOURNAL became necessary. All the speeches given are represented in the following brief summaries supplied by the speakers.

GEORGE A. KUBLER, *Mexican Urbanism in the Sixteenth Century*. The plan of the Mexican towns of the sixteenth century may be approached through contemporary drawings made by Indian draughtsman. The principal elements of the Mexican plan were the fortified church within an otherwise unfortified city, and the symmetrical, monumental square at the intersection of the axes. The principle of the fortress church within an "open" town probably derives from the experience of the mendicant

orders in the resettlement in southwestern France during the thirteenth century after the devastation of the Albigensian Crusade. The symmetrical, centrally-located plaza of monumental character, on the other hand, appears to be a realization of late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century Italian theory of urban practice. In Europe, however, urban practice was unable to keep step with the theoretical speculations, and it is likely that Mexico offered an open field for the realization of otherwise theoretical considerations. The number of towns founded in Mexico is very great; as an effort of colonial urbanization, the program anticipates the normal forms of later European urban practice.

ELIZABETH WILDER, *Contemporary Painting in the Americas*. Is it possible to generalize about "American paintings" all over the Western Hemisphere? Study of the main currents shows a significant parallelism throughout the development of art in Latin America and the United States. Dating "contemporary" painting from the Mexican revolution of the 1920s, we find not only the influence of Rivera, Orozco, and Siqueiros, but similar nationalistic and social tendencies all over the Americas: in our own Regionalism and Post-Office murals; in the new Andean art of Peru (Sabogal), of Bolivia (Guzmán de Rojas) and Ecuador (Camilo Egas); in the indigenous interests of Colombian (Acuña), Cuban (Abela, Gattorno), and Brazilian painters. Obviously no particular subject-matter, nor any one theory of art, is inviolable. The Americas, only now emerging from their colonialism, are faced with the common problem of discovering themselves, and of defining originality. In the art of such painters as Figari, Torres García, Pettoruti, Camilo Mori, Flavio de Carvalho, Cândido Portinari, Lasar Segall, Julia Rossi Osir, Codesido, Eduardo Kingman, Guayasamín, Rojas Ulloa, Daniel Serra, Zalce, Orozco Romero, Rodríguez Lozano, Guerrero Galván, Juan Soriano, Leopoldo Méndez, Tebo, one finds the new generation searching for honest and personal expression. In this movement for individuality, the Americas still act in sympathy.

AGNES ADDISON, *William Strickland—American Architect*. William Strickland (born Philadelphia 1789, died Nashville 1854), while primarily known as an architect and secondarily as an engineer, holds an important place in the history of American art both as a painter and as an engraver, especially for his aquatints. As an architect, he is representative of his period in that he used a variety of styles: Federal, Gothic, Saracenic, Egyptian and Italianate as well as Greek. His most famous buildings are of the Greek Revival style, in which he was trained by Latrobe and for which he used the plates of the *Antiquities of Athens* by Stuart and Revett for his inspiration. For the Second Bank of the United States (1819-1824), he used the Doric order of the Parthenon; for the Merchants Exchange (1834), he used the Choragic monument of Lysicrates for the tower; for

the Capitol of Tennessee (1845-1859), he used the monument again and for the porticos the Ionic order of the Erechtheum. His great contribution as an architect was that he revived the architectural forms of classical Greece as recorded by Stuart and Revett and adapted them to the architecture of this country.

LLOYD GOODRICH, *Scholarship in American Art*. Scholarship in American art is relatively recent and offers special opportunities for original research. Its best achievements so far have been in the colonial and early republican periods. More recent periods have been less thoroughly studied; there is much literature but it is chiefly biographical and appreciative. The essential thing about an artist being his work, one of the most important functions of the scholar is to record it. There have been few attempts to do this for American artists. The need for such records is emphasized by numerous forgeries of Ryder, Homer, Whistler, Inness, Blakelock and other important figures. The victims are not only inexperienced buyers but leading museums, collectors and dealers. The remedy is better scholarship and more intensive research on individual artists. This is a day of specialization; experts can no longer cover the whole American field. I propose that museums and colleges encourage such research in their own institutions, and that they sponsor a central bureau for research and authentication; the bureau to call on the best qualified experts for opinions, and to conduct cooperative research designed to relieve scholars of routine work and thus foster higher standards of scholarship. Research also to extend to contemporary art by recording the works of about fifty selected living artists, so that the present confusion as to authenticity shall not occur in the future.

HENRI FOCILLON, *The Historian of Art and the Artist*.¹ L'analyse des principes de la recherche est au coeur de toute investigation positive ainsi qu'une définition rigoureuse de l'objet particulier de toute étude. Et d'abord que cherche-t-on—une série chronologique, le roman d'une vie humaine, le mouvement d'un style, la signification d'une image, le secret d'une technique, la valeur sociologique de l'oeuvre d'art? Tout cela, et bien d'autres choses encore si l'on considère qu'à la multiplicité des points de vue s'ajoute l'heureuse diversité des esprits.

Peut-être, la vitalité d'une science se mesure-t-elle à la place qu'elle fait aux diverses exigences de l'esprit? La nôtre en accueille toutes les variétés, parfois même jusqu'à leur déréglement. Il reste qu'un certain nombre de principes absolument fixés dominent toutes ces nuances; ils sont conformes aux règles fondamentales de la vie intellectuelle; ils en traduisent la probité. Ils coïncident dans une large mesure avec les règles de la méthode

¹Summary of the message to members of the College Art Association, from Professor Focillon who, to the great regret of all, was prevented by illness from presenting a paper.

historique, mais la méthode historique les contient-elle tous et tout entiers? On peut l'admettre que l'oeuvre d'art est une expression du temps, mais elle est aussi un certain traitement de l'espace et de la matière, et là, il nous faut bien dessiner des courbes nouvelles, nous servir d'un vocabulaire particulier, essayer de définir des données constantes et des données variables.

Ne conviendrait-il pas de nous souvenir aussi quelquefois que l'oeuvre d'art est non le travail de l'historien, mais le travail de l'artiste? Aussi nous a-t-il toujours paru nécessaire d'interroger l'artiste lui-même, ce constructeur de phénomènes historiques à part, pour bien comprendre ses ressources, sa logique propre, sa conception du monde, de l'homme et de la vie. Il n'existe pas qu'un seul type d'intellectuel et admettons comme une base absolument stable que l'artiste seul détient les secrets essentiels de l'art. L'artiste n'est pas un inconscient, guidé par l'inspiration; sa vie intérieure obéit à une certaine technique dont il connaît, dont il fait jouer les ressorts. Il en prolonge les faits au dehors par des artifices qui ont quelque chose de magique. Comme les savants de laboratoire, il travaille dans la matière qu'il transfigure en se servant de sa main pour créer des formes son monde propre.

Nous vivons dans un temps où l'on fait un étrange abus des valeurs spirituelles, on les découvre, il n'est plus question que d'elles. De là une peinture, une sculpture, une musique sans matière, une architecture sans poids. En réintroduisant la matière, non seulement dans les données nobles et dans les données authentiques de l'art, ne rendons-nous pas service à la vie de l'esprit qui, sans elle, languit dans un faux idéalisme inapte à la vie? Il est bien vrai qu'il existe dans les matières de l'art un ordre supérieur et nécessaire sans lequel l'art ne serait pas. Est-il indifférent que le Parthénon soit en marbre et non en brique; que Rembrandt soit aquafortiste et non lithographe; qu'Ingres se soit servi d'un crayon dur et non d'un pinceau d'aquarelliste pour ses dessins de portraits?

SIRAPIE DER NERSESSIAN, *The Direct Approach in the Study of Art History*.¹ The aim of this method of teaching is to supplement historical and critical studies by immediate knowledge of the technical elements responsible for distinguishing features of style. Initiated at Wellesley in 1897 by Professor Alice Van Vechten Brown, it has been in practice ever since, with constant modification and adjustment of details providing ample opportunity to test the method and recognize its advantages. Practical exercises directed by an instructor trained in an art school are carried out in close collaboration with a study of the monuments under direction of an art historian. These exercises as distinguished from courses devoted to practice of the arts are not intended to train future artists but to acquaint students with the formal aspects of a work of art. They deal with such problems as the stylization of the human figure, examined in connection

¹ For the full text of this paper see p. 54 and footnote.

with the living model, the management of light and shade, the properties of color, the relation of planes, etc. Some exercises are concerned with special techniques; others consist of original compositions in the style of different artists; others relate to architecture or composition. Although one third of the class appointments is set aside for this practical work, the result is a gain rather than a loss of time, for the student is equipped with a fundamental knowledge of technique and style, providing a sound basis for advanced work.

WILHELM R. W. KOEHLER, *The Principle of Collaborative Research*. This paper discussed the cooperative method of research now in progress at Dumbarton Oaks, and suggested that a committee be appointed for the following purposes: 1) to select groups of material from all periods of art history which could best be dealt with by application of the principle; 2) to consider whether a portion of the financial resources available for research might not well be set aside for such collaborative projects. The resulting concentration of energies and subsidies on comprehensive and essential research projects would be of advantage both to the individual engaged in research and to scholarship in general, and would help research in the humanities to survive in the difficult times which are ahead of us. (For a brief summary of the plan of work at Dumbarton Oaks, see the COLLEGE ART JOURNAL, I, 2, p. 34-36.)

ERWIN PANOFSKY, *Traffic Accidents in the Relation between Texts and Pictures*. The paper presented a brief illustration of some of the curious problems, trivial to the student of iconography but not always sufficiently realized by others, which confront the art historian when trying to co-ordinate pictures with textual sources. These include the intrusion of representational traditions upon the data of the text, particularly notable when pagan types are adapted to Christian themes and vice versa; the "delayed action" of certain texts which existed for many centuries before they gave rise to visual realizations, as is the case with the "Pietà," or with the "modern" formula of the Nativity, in which the Virgin Mary is shown kneeling in prayer before the Christ Child, instead of reclining on a couch; iconographical innovations caused by the misinterpretation of texts by artists; and others occasioned by a faulty transmission of the texts themselves, like the misreading of "sedes fingatur" for "sedes fingatur" which led to the introduction of empty chairs and stools in the *Triumph of Cybele* in the Palazzo Schifanoia at Ferrara. A more complex relationship occurs when a text serves as an intermediary between two images the latter of which may then, in turn, lead to a re-formulation of the original text, as in the case of the *Calumny of Apelles*. In conclusion there was a glimpse of the difficulties entailed by errors or ambiguities in texts purporting to describe or to paraphrase works of art.

EVERETT V. MEEKS, *Speech at Annual Dinner*. The development of art instruction at Yale, from its inception in 1866 with the appointment of

John Ferguson Weir, was briefly reviewed. Starting with instruction in drawing and painting, the curriculum was expanded to include by 1869 the history of art and the critical approach, giving the art student as well-rounded an education as that offered by other professions. The coordination between two fields of study, creative and critical, and the relation between the objective study of art and the study of the social sciences and even of pure science was made clear. The cleavage of program and opinion as evidenced by the extreme of "reaction" on one hand—specifically objectivity and the superaccentuation of technique—and on the other hand "progressiveness," characterized by the abandonment of representation and the superdevelopment of subjectivity was deplored. But the speaker suggested that a rational balance between subjective and objective qualities in art is already being shown, and that new stimulus, vigor and quality in the progress of art may be expected. The necessity for maintaining cultural values in the present emergency was stressed to provide for that period of moral reconstruction which is to follow and in which the arts will play a most important part.

PHYLLIS WILLIAMS, *A Hellenistic Cult and its Expression in Art*. A hitherto unexplained building in the sanctuary of Hera Basileia in Pergamon can be interpreted as a religious community house of a type found in a number of ancient mystery cults. This simple, rectangular building installed with a *stibadium* or couch may well have been used by the initiates for sacramental meals. The Sacred House and the sanctuary of Demeter in Priene, the Samothrakion in Delos, and the Attaleion in Pergamon are strikingly similar examples of this type of community building for the initiates of a cult. The importance of the mystery cult of Hera Basileia is attested by innumerable monuments ranging from vase painting to sculptured reliefs, and is particularly well documented by an extensive passage in the Augustan writer, Diodorus Siculus. These monuments, together with a description of the goddess in Dio Chrysostomos, enable us to identify the principal figure in the famous painting of Herakles finding his son Telephos in the Museo Nazionale in Naples as a representation of Basileia, the tutelary divinity of Pergamon.

RICHARD BERNHEIMER, *Wild Men, A Remnant of Pre-History in Medieval Art*. In describing the medieval iconography of wild men, besides several others two great strands of tradition must be distinguished: one that stems from the teratological literature of the ancients and describes wild men as fabulous inhabitants of far-away countries and another that conceives of them as demons of vegetation and of fertility. The latter interpretation which has its origin in pre-Christian beliefs can be used to explain several traits in wild man iconography: their appearance as bearers of armorial shields, for wild men symbolize progeny; their association with real and imaginary forest animals, for as demons of vegetation they are the lords of the forests; finally, the part they take in medieval allegories

of love. In the earlier forms of such allegory (thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries) wild men, being the embodiment of passion, function as adversaries of pure courtly love. Since the late fourteenth century, owing to the degeneration of knightly ideals the situation is reversed and the aristocracy of the French and Burgundian courts, accepting the lower forms of passion, occasionally dresses up in wild men's furs. In the fifteenth century the life of the wild man was frequently looked upon sentimentally as an existence so simple and elementary as to be unaffected by the artificiality of contemporary life.

WALTER HORN, *Construction and Dating of S. Miniato in Florence*. An analysis of the masonry of S. Miniato reveals that the church, contrary to general belief, is not a homogeneous structure, but was built in three successive stages: 1) the eastern crypt walls, which differ from the choir walls above, in having a more primitive type of masonry and in not providing for buttresses (observation of U. Middeldorf); 2) the choir in its entire height, the aisle walls, and the first story of the façade; 3) the clerestory of the nave and the second story of the façade, shown by a heretofore unobserved break in the masonry between the third and fourth eastern clerestory-windows, and from changes in the capitals and interior decoration.

By comparing the masonry of S. Miniato with that of other datable Florentine churches of the period, one can identify the eastern crypt walls with Bishop Hildebrand's construction started in 1014. This masonry is more advanced than that of the Badia di Firenze (967-978) and the Badia di Settimo (988-1011), but less developed than that of S. Pier' Scheraggio (dedicated 1068) and Santi Apostoli (1058-1075). The masonry of the second period, by comparison with the two last named churches and the Collegiata di Empoli, can be dated approximately between 1070 and 1090. The clerestory of the nave can not have been built before the second quarter of the twelfth century since its pilaster capitals are more advanced than those of the attic of the Baptistry (1058-1128). These observations force revision of the traditional dating of S. Miniato (1014-1062).

BARTLETT H. HAYES, JR., *Art before College*. With certain exceptions few secondary schools offered art as a serious study ten years ago, while today there is almost nationwide inclusion of some form of art in the school curriculum. This change seems to have been directly influenced by the progressive education movement, a general widespread interest in art, the increase in art publications and the W.P.A. Although instruction of art has been subordinated to other subjects in secondary schools, it is evident that some experience in the visual arts will not only lead to a more comprehensive perception in other fields of study, but also to greater understanding of art. The standards of this instruction could be raised if the college art departments were to cooperate with the secondary schools in making art education a continuous undivided proc-

ess. This *might* be accomplished by 1) examinations; 2) collaboration with museums on problems of pre-college education; 3) lectures on art to teachers in other fields and 4) higher standards of popular art in magazines and television. In brief, the quality of education in pre-college years determines the standards of scholarship at college in the long run.

WILLIAM H. PIERSON, JR. *The Function of the Studio Course in Teaching Art History*. The paper was a report on a program for the integration of the practical and the historical aspects of art. This program is not designed to train professional artists. It is directed rather toward the average college student. In it the student is brought into direct contact with the formal aspects of a work of art through actual studio exercises. These exercises, however, do not exist as ends in themselves but are closely related to the study of works of art as historical documents. The work in the studio is always correlated with the work in the class room. By becoming familiar with the fundamentals of artistic form through laboratory experiments the student is given a basis from which to develop his analytical and critical powers. He becomes aware of the basic characteristics of style and is able to discriminate between objects without having to resort to superficial memory devices. By his own experience with materials and methods he becomes more aware of the subtleties in artistic form. He learns the technical problems which confront the artist in the process of creation and responds to fine craftsmanship and technical performance. He knows not only the historical evolution of a picture but he knows it also as a work of art.

H. W. JANSON, *The Beginnings of Agostino di Duccio*. A marble relief of the Madonna and Child in the Opera del duomo in Florence, formerly accredited to Pagno di Lapo, may be attributed to Agostino di Duccio by comparison with the five Madonna reliefs generally accepted as his works. In this panel, Agostino's style, still in process of formation, is influenced by the early Madonnas and the Cantoria of Luca della Robbia, suggesting that Agostino was a pupil of Luca rather than of Donatello, and a date between 1435 and 1440. In Agostino's earliest signed and dated work, the four reliefs of 1442 on Modena Cathedral, the influence of Luca has been displaced by that of Michelozzo with whom Agostino may have worked in the SS. Annunziata. Agostino's Madonna reliefs have hitherto all been assigned to the mid-1460s. However, the example in the National Gallery, Washington, D.C. is akin to the Modena reliefs and reveals the influence of Michelozzo, so that it must be dated around 1445. The Madonna from Auvilliers in the Louvre must have been carved soon afterwards, since its style bridges the gap between the Washington panel and Agostino's Rimini sculptures, begun after 1447. The Madonna formerly in the chapel of the Accademia and the one in the Victoria and Albert Museum are related to Agostino's work in

Perugia in the 1460s. The Rothschild Madonna in the Louvre reflects a composition of Verrocchio and may be dated around 1470.

C. L. V. MEEKS, *Mannerist Churches in Florence*. Florentine church architecture in the sixteenth century grows out of fifteenth century Tuscan style, is influenced by Michelangelo, and culminates in the work of Buontalenti in the 1590s. In the seventeenth century, the style is formalized by the Accademia but continues to be influential through the eighteenth century. The new style was evolved during the reigns of the Grand Dukes. There was a strong government, peace and prosperity. The arts were encouraged; manufacturies of tapestry, porcelain, and *pietra dura* were founded. The architects, unlike the painters, were not subject to religious or literary control. The canon was anti-Renaissance in spirit, subjective and personal; classical and mathematical rules were subordinated to individual preferences. *Grazia*, *gusto* and *spirito* were qualities leading to the desired *maniera*. The principal architects were Vasari, Ammanati, Buontalenti, who were sculptors, painters, or engineers as well. Their style had the basic Tuscan characteristics: calligraphic, bichromatic, and elegant; never massive as in Rome or rustic as in the North. The façade was regarded as one or more loosely defined frames, within which a series of panels advance from and recede into the structural wall plane. Within these, in turn, are intricately ornamented accents. These elements are woven into a sensuous, undulating, textile-like surface, alternately taut and relaxed, which is neither gay nor sombre, but rather self-consciously elegant, thus reflecting the character of the Medici court. In its intricacy and restrained virtuosity the artistocratic architecture of Tuscany in this period is no less accomplished than that of the fifteenth century.

ROBERT M. WALKER, *Rembrandt as a Landscape Draughtsman*. Though unsigned the etching, *Landscape with a Man Sketching*, H.213, has always been accepted by Rembrandt critics from Gersaint to Hind as the work of one of the greatest of landscape draughtsmen. But on the basis of an intensive stylistic comparison with the *Landscape with a Haybarn*, H.177, a signed and dated etching of 1641, the unsigned landscape, which Hind dates in the middle 1640s, shows certain fundamental weaknesses in graphic organization. Taking the *Haybarn* as a characteristic example, an investigation of Rembrandt's space composition indicates that the master's principal means are aerial perspective, atmospheric perspective, the suggestion of solid form, and the continuity of planes. His graphic organization reveals a complete understanding and control of perspective and chiaroscuro, a masterly ability to suggest organic form, and a remarkable power to achieve coherent, articulate continuity of planes. The *Landscape with a Man Sketching* under such an analysis betrays underneath a superficial dexterity a fundamental lack of sensitivity and control in space organization. It is just these characteristics which are found

in the graphic work of the men in Rembrandt's circle of the 1640s, such as Gerbrand van den Eeckhout and Philips de Koninck, though on the basis of a scarcity of evidence it is not yet possible to attribute to an individual artist the etching whose authenticity as a genuine Rembrandt should be seriously questioned.

WOLFGANG STECHOW, *Shooting at Father's Corpse*. The paper deals with the legend of a nobleman with several sons, one of them good (legitimate), the other(s) bad (illegitimate). When the father died the sons contended for the heritage. A wise judge placed the father's body before the sons, telling them to shoot at it with arrows, the one with best aim to be adjudged the heir. The bad one(s) pierced the body, but the good one refused to do so and was therefore recognized as the real son and heir. The legend, of oriental origin, one version occurring in the Talmud, reappeared in the thirteenth century in various forms, the most popular of which, a French *Fabliau*, identified the wise judge as Solomon. As a result, the story frequently appeared in Bible illustrations mainly on title-pages of the *Proverbs*, although no biblical text nor commentary refers to it. The legend is found also on reliefs, and later upon cassoni and in engravings, partly as a Solomon story, partly in a more general didactic fashion not connected with Solomon. In the sixteenth century the legend, in a deliberate literary fake, was transformed into an ancient exemplum by the same process that restored true ancient stories to their former status, and its renderings mirror this transformation convincingly.

HENRY R. HOPE, *The Early Years of Henry van de Velde*. The *art nouveau* style, characterized by long, swinging curves and flat surface patterns, began to appear in architecture and decorative arts of Europe and America in the last decade of the nineteenth century. Its first definitive appearance in Europe is found in Belgium in the work of Horta, van de Velde, and others. Henry van de Velde soon became the leader of the movement because of his combined artistic and intellectual ability. The chief sources of Belgian *art nouveau* are: 1) the writings of Morris and Ruskin; 2) the English arts and crafts movement; 3) the development of symbolism in Belgian literature and painting. In addition van de Velde and his friends were strongly influenced by the development of flat pattern and curving lines in the painting of Seurat, Gauguin and others in France between 1886 and 1893 (cf. Robert J. Goldwater, "Some Aspects of the Development of Seurat's Style," *The Art Bulletin*, XXIII, 2, p. 117-30).

Van de Velde's special contribution during the early years of the movement (1892-1895) was a vigorous pattern made by a repetition of simple stylized motifs and, in his architecture and furniture, an emphasis upon broad planes and restrained curves which differ considerably from the whip-lash and vine-tendrill curves employed in the work of Horta.

FREDERICK B. DEKNATEL, *Manet and the Formation of Cézanne's Art*. Such works by Cézanne as the still life of the *Black Clock*, the landscape

of the *Railway Cutting* in Munich, the *Girl at the Piano* in Moscow, all dated by recent students of Cézanne between 1868 and 1871, are the earliest in which there is definite realization of his revolutionary artistic vision. If this is true, the sources of the fundamentals of Cézanne's art must be looked for in the '60s in Cézanne himself and in his artistic environment. It follows also that the Impressionist experience of Cézanne in the '70s, however important for his final perfection as an artist, cannot be considered the turning point in his career. This paper emphasizes the earlier period as being of more basic significance in the formation of our painter and attempts to show that these masterpieces, before his close association with Pissarro and his assimilation of Impressionist technique, contain the essential fundamentals on which the works of his maturity are based. These fundamentals should be considered as the results of a process of developing to new and really revolutionary conclusions certain artistic procedures that appeared in or were uncovered by the work of Edouard Manet in the 1860s. In arriving at these new conclusions Cézanne laid the foundations of modern art.

REPORT OF THE BUSINESS MEETING OF MEMBERS

The following brief summary of over three hours of active discussion is necessarily incomplete. Any member may, however, receive the full minutes of the meeting by writing to the offices of the Association, 625 Madison Avenue, New York City.

It may be said that the past year has been a successful one for the Association. The officers and directors have continued the policy of the past few years in attempting to clarify the position of the Association as a national institution interested in art education at a college level. They have been encouraged by the fact that there have been only ninety-one cancellations of memberships as against one hundred and ninety-seven new members. Nine new institutions have generously added their names to the list of sponsors of *The Art Bulletin*; and the directors are extremely fortunate in being able to announce that Rensselaer W. Lee of Smith College has accepted the position of Editor of this important quarterly to take office in 1943, after the expired term of Millard Meiss of Columbia University. We are also happy to reaffirm our gratitude to the Carnegie Corporation for its allocation of ten thousand dollars to the Association to be used as grants-in-aid for mature students in the Fine Arts.

In the discussion relative to the COLLEGE ART JOURNAL suggestions from members in the Midwest led to the motion that the Publications committee of the Association be instructed to investigate the possibility of adopting an editorial policy similar to that of the *Magazine of Art*, providing, of course, that financial support could be assured for such a venture. A report on this motion will be made in the very near future.

Favorable opinions were expressed for the present modest form of the

JOURNAL, which does not duplicate other publications in the field and which supplies a valuable medium for the open discussion of problems vital to art education and scholarship in this country. It was recalled that this JOURNAL was established on an experimental basis dependent on the reaction of the membership. Only an intelligent cooperation on the part of contributors can assure its success. It may be possible to expand its size if the material submitted justifies such a move and if the finances of the Association permit. Outside subsidies as in the case of *The Art Bulletin* might make this possible.

Questions were also raised in regard to the regional groups of the Association. It was made evident that at present the relationship of these groups to the Association is indefinite. It was generally felt that such groups might be of great value in stimulating discussion of local problems and it is hoped that members throughout the country may have suggestions to aid the committee in their considerations of this problem.

The officers and directors of the Association wish to take this opportunity to thank all those members who contributed so generously to the success of the meeting. They also wish to express to the membership as a whole their realization of the responsibilities placed on them to assure the continued effectiveness of the Association in a nation at war.—SUMNER MCK. CROSBY

NEWS REPORTS

THE FINE ARTS DEPARTMENT OF INDIANA UNIVERSITY has recently expanded its building, equipment, and teaching staff, both for the History of Art the Practice of Art. A glance at the map will show that we are pretty far away from the important art collections and museums of Chicago, St. Louis, and Cincinnati, which we can only visit by occasional bus trips. It is our conviction that neither the History nor the Practice of Art can be adequately taught without direct contact with works of art. Thus, an important part of our building is a new, fireproof, fluorescent-lighted gallery, in which to show exhibitions of painting, sculpture, drawing, and prints. It is not an easy matter to borrow original works of value, but we have been quite successful in obtain-

ing paintings by the living artists.

Our most effective teaching of oil painting is with still life material, and to enable students to see how this subject has been approached at different periods we have obtained, thanks to the collaboration of two New York dealers, the Mortimer Brandt Gallery and the Schaeffer Galleries, an exhibition of twenty-two masterpieces of still life painting, including such men as the Dutchmen, Hondecoeter and Jan Fyt, the Frenchmen, Monnoyer and Géricault, and the Spaniard, Menendez. The exhibition will last from March 1st to March 15th.

There are five thousand students on this campus, and for many of them it will be the first time that they have seen a painting by an old

master. We hope the success of this show will enable us to continue this policy with important exhibitions at least once every semester.—HENRY R. HOPE, *Indiana University*

THE WORCESTER (MASS.) ART MUSEUM is presenting an exhibition entitled "A Decade of American Painting, 1930-1940," from February 18 through March 22, 1942. It is the aim of this exhibition to illustrate certain milestones in the development of American painting during the last decade. Deprived to a large extent of private patronage because of the depression, the American artist of the 1930s had frequently to depend on Government patronage for his livelihood and inspiration. He thus lost some of his traditional isolated individualism and became a rather self-conscious member of the body politic. On the other hand, as a sensitive barometer of his period, he recorded in his work the growing sense of uncertainty and confusion, though less strongly than his European contemporary. Especially in the early thirties, his product remained a compromise between painting for its own sake and the American tradition of realism. It became the interpretation of "The American Scene," a somewhat nostalgic yearning for the "Good Old Horse and Buggy Days." As the decade progressed, however, realism became more insistent, and increasingly tinged with satire and rebellion against destructive forces.

The exhibition committee makes no claim to presenting a "cross section" of American painting, or "the

fifty great paintings," but rather "fifty representative paintings" of the 1930s. The pictures have been selected with the aid of a national advisory committee composed of art critics, museum officials responsible for the large exhibitions of the decade, directors of government art projects, and art dealers. Each was asked to submit a list of ten paintings which he regarded as "most significant in themselves and in their contribution to American painting of the period." Their suggestions have been supplemented by a study of references in art journals of the decade, and of the jury awards in the larger exhibitions. From a list of about three hundred pictures submitted, final selections were made by the Museum's exhibition committee.

A remarkable unanimity of choice was shown. In many cases, regardless of personal taste, the "conservatives" joined with the "moderns" in recommending the work of a painter of independent or advanced tendencies as significant because of his contribution to the decade. Even so limited a perspective as that of this ten-year period tends to establish agreement on certain values not recognized in a wholly contemporary exhibition. Whether these values have a reasonable permanence is, of course, conjectural.

The majority of pictures in this exhibition have appeared on the national exhibition circuit, they have generally, although not universally, been commented on favorably by the critics, a considerable number have won prize awards, and almost

all the artists included have today dealer representation. — CONDENSED FROM THE OFFICIAL ANNOUNCEMENT

AT THE INSTITUTE OF FINE ARTS OF NEW YORK UNIVERSITY the graduate students have issued a new publication (*Marsyas*, Vol. I, 1941, \$2.50). This magazine, to be issued annually, is devoted entirely to original research in the history of art produced by students while enrolled at the Institute. The editorial board was chosen by the students from among their members. Volume II is now in preparation.—ESTHER GORDON

THE SAN FRANCISCO ART ASSOCIATION announces that it will consider applications for traveling scholarships from the Abraham Rosenberg Fund

until March 31, 1942. Applicants must have been registered in the California School of Fine Arts for at least two semesters and have completed original work in the fine arts. The Scholarship for 1942 will be given in any of the subjects taught at the School.

THE UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION asks that publicity be given to its call for artistic and mechanical lithographers to produce the maps needed by our Army, Navy and Merchant Marine. Examination announcements and application forms may be obtained at first- and second-class post offices or from the Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C.

BOOK REVIEWS

KARL NIERENDORF, *Paul Klee*, introduction by James Johnson Sweeney, 37 p., 65 pl., two in color. New York, 1941, Oxford University Press. \$6.00.

This volume is primarily conceived as a picture book presenting on sixty-five full-page reproductions some gleanings from the work of this star-gazer of the inward sensorial sphere. The choice and the reproduction of the originals are highly satisfactory. And yet only the two color reproductions do justice to a type of creation in which material, message and effect coincide. As in a bell without a clapper no tone can ring out from a monochrome reproduction of a Klee watercolor or painting.

Sweeney's introduction is a some-

what labored discussion of the basically ideographic function of art. His generalizations and sweeping statements will hardly explain Klee to anybody who has not already understood him. Nierendorf's biographical sketch is more substantial. Writing with personal knowledge of his hero and with warm understanding he not only depicts an attractive image of the artist but presents besides some interpretations of Klee's work which can open a door into the esoteric universe of this painter.

Klee's *oeuvre* presents some disconcerting problems to the willing but critical onlooker; if complete realization in the sense of Cézanne is an indication of a masterpiece then Klee's work has the proper

emarks. It is of utmost definition as far as its form is concerned and of utmost sincerity as far as the creator is concerned. Yet does his work have that generality of reference which characterizes the work of the great master?

The college student will find in this book a guide into a world of abstracted sense experiences and evocative dreams. Klee's hieroglyphics can train his sensitivity just as they can pamper his irresponsibility. Lonely and happily, like Rousseau's *Boats on the Oise River*, the Klees glide down the stream of the subconscious.

ALFRED NEUMEYER
Mills College

JOSÉ GUDIOL i RICART, *Goya*, 122 p., 72 pl. New York, 1941, Hyperion Press. \$4.00.

This most recent work on Goya is a book of illustrations, one of the Hyperion series originally published in Paris and now produced in New York. The present volume, we regret to say, is the most disappointing yet issued by this publisher, whose standards have fallen sharply since their books have been printed here. The sixteen reproductions in color recall the harshness of the old-fashioned commercial calendar. A few of the black and white reproductions could be termed adequate, but most of them are dark and muddy in outline. The fault must be placed squarely upon the printer, for the reproductions were made from original photographs of excellent quality by Mas, Moreno, Gudiol, and others.

Mr. Gudiol in his text traces in

chronological order the various stages of Goya's career and cites the principal works of the artist, indicating stylistic changes as they occur. Many of the pictures illustrated, such as the decorations in the church of the Pilar at Saragossa, the *Descent from the Cross* from Sobradriel, and the *Death of St. Joseph* in Santa Ana at Valladolid, are especially interesting because they are seldom reproduced. On the other hand, a great work like the *Execution of the Madrileños* is represented only by a sketch in very bad color. The illustrations of other major pictures such as the *Family of Charles IV*, the *Maja Vestida*, and the *Maja Desnuda* are small and completely inadequate, whereas space is given to reproduce all six of the *Margato Series* in the Art Institute at Chicago, which, however entertaining, are not among Goya's great achievements.

Mr. Gudiol's new book is not intended to compete with a comprehensive catalogue like A. L. Mayer's *Goya* (Munich, 1923). It might have been an excellent medium for undergraduate instruction, had the reproductions been of better quality, and had the text been edited for English composition and printed with attention to consistency in spelling and in the use of Spanish accents.

HAROLD E. WETHEY
University of Michigan

Donatello, introduction by Ludwig Goldscheider. Phaidon Edition. 46 p., 149 pl. New York, 1941, Oxford University Press. \$3.50.

Since the beginning of the cen-

tury, there has been a dangerous tendency among certain writers on modern art to champion the cause of Post-Impressionism by disparaging the achievements of some of the great masters of the past. Perhaps the most severe of these campaigns of deprecation has been directed against Donatello. According to Sheldon Cheney, to quote but one instance, the bronze *David* in the Bargello is "intolerably insipid as sculpture . . . sentimentally literary, over-detailed, weak," and the master's importance is no more than "that of a culminating figure in an era of the decadence of sculpture as a creative art" (cf. *A World History of Art*, p. 499). Negative evaluations such as this, implying that in order to appreciate Lehmbruck one must despise Donatello, not only put an exorbitantly high price upon the understanding of modern art, they perpetuate an entirely inadequate conception of Donatello's style as "photographic realism," a conception formulated by 19th century critics and long since discarded by the best authorities on the subject. Thus there has long been a need for an easily accessible and visually impressive publication of the master's works that would demonstrate to a larger public the true scope and vitality of Donatello's genius. The plates of the new Phaidon edition answer this need in an admirable manner. Almost all of them reproduce splendid new photographs by Ilse Schneider-Lengyel, with special emphasis upon little known details and views from unconventional angles. Unfortunately, the value of

the book as a whole is limited by various shortcomings, owing to lack of care on the part of the editor. The coverage of the material is far from even; a number of full-page plates are devoted to pieces that have long been eliminated from the master's *oeuvre*, while several important works appear only among the small and indifferent illustrations of the Introduction. The text, intended as an informative survey of scholarly opinion, summarizes old errors and half-truths along with recent findings, but fails to differentiate between them. As a consequence, the volume represents a magnificent picture-book rather than an authoritative guide to the art of Donatello.

H. W. JANSON
Washington University

KIMON NICOLAÏDES, *The Natural Way to Draw*, xiv + 221 p., numerous illus. New York, 1941, Houghton Mifflin Company. \$3.00.

No one ever learned to draw by reading a book, and the author of *The Natural Way to Draw* does not pretend that one can. But a book can direct the student's personal effort and investigations, and anyone who follows scrupulously the schedules and outlines of work set down by Nicolaïdes would find it impossible not to learn something about drawing and, incidentally, about the physical phenomena that surround our daily life.

Drawing to Nicolaïdes is more than the mechanical tracing of an object in outline. It is understanding, knowing, thinking, feeling; it

is a full comprehension of everything we attempt to draw; it is the touching of the form not only with the crayon but with the intellect, and adding to that the warmth which distinguishes a work of art from a routine performance.

Nicolaïdes points out that there is no formula by which drawing in this sense may be learned. He warns that the student must work constantly and furiously, and to indicate clearly what this implies he outlines a regime that would kill the average dilettante. By such a disciplinary program he disposes of the fallacy that temperament, rather than creative force and sustaining intelligence, has most to do with art.

The working schedules given with each chapter, which should be followed in relation to the explanatory text, take the student through progressive stages from "scribbling," gesture, and contour drawing to long, comprehensive studies of form, design, and content. The approach is romantic rather than

classic, the emphasis being placed upon "gesture," (not to be interpreted as action drawing). Gesture drawing is the thematic structure upon which Nicolaïdes hangs a very sound philosophic lecture. The continuity of thought, however, is interrupted by a rather too brief and perfunctory discussion of anatomy and color and one might also wish for more informative chapters on composition.

Nicolaïdes, who died in 1938, was for years an extremely popular and capable teacher at the Art Students League in New York. His humanity and understanding, his sound philosophy, his masterly teaching are attested to by hundreds of former students and friends, many of whom, particularly Miss Mamie Harmon, helped in compiling and publishing this book. His honesty and humility are reflected in his writing and his book is as genuinely devoid of dogma as was his verbal teaching.

RAYMOND BAXTER DOWDEN
The Cooper Union

BOOKS RECEIVED

The Museum of Modern Art, New York, has published two monographs in connection with its Dali-Miro exhibition, Nov. 26, 1941-Jan. 24, 1942: *Salvador Dali* by JAMES THRALL SOBY, described as "the first comprehensive study of Dali's art" (63 pl., 4 in color. \$2.00); and *Joan Miro* by JAMES JOHNSON SWEENEY, described as "the first monograph on the subject" (70 pl., 4 in color. \$2.00). *The Unseen Rembrandt* by WILLIAM M. IVINS, JR. is a publication of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, in connection with its exhibition of that artist's paintings, drawings and prints. This is a book of 84 plates, mostly detail enlargements (\$2.50). *Smith College Museum of Art, Northampton, Mass. has published Italian Drawings, 1330-1780*, a catalogue of an exhibition (Dec. 1-20, 1941) arranged for the class in Italian painting by RUTH WEDGE-

WOOD KENNEDY and ALPHONS P. A. VORENKAMP (\$1.50). *They Taught Themselves* by SIDNEY JANIS, with a foreword by ALFRED H. BARR, JR., is a study of American primitive painters of the twentieth century. Published by the Dial Press, New York (88 pl., 2 in color. \$3.50). *Art in Human Affairs* by NORMAN CHARLES MEIER is designed to be used as an introduction to the psychology of art (45 figs. in text, 4 in color. \$2.25). The McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York is the publisher. Miscellaneous items received include: the 1941 edition of *Notes Hispanic*, an annual devoted to the art and craftsmanship of Spain and Portugal, published by the Hispanic Society of America, New York (\$1.00); and *An Amphora with a Price Inscription* by D. A. AMYX, University of California Press, Berkeley, Calif. (paper, \$.25).

MICROFILMS

American Indian Art Exhibit, University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan. \$5.50.

University Microfilms has announced this photographic record of the Exhibition of American Indian Art at the San Francisco Exhibition of 1939, in addition to the *Survey of American Painting* reviewed in the last issue (COLLEGE

ART JOURNAL, I, 2, p. 41-42). It includes 250 pictures, covering the building displays and individual items. Like the *Survey of American Painting*, this film may be used on an ordinary microfilm reader, projected on the screen as strip film, or cut and mounted into 2" x 2" glass slides. Both films were initiated by the Carnegie Corporation.

AN ANNOUNCEMENT TO MEMBERS

At the annual meeting of the American Council of Learned Societies, held in Philadelphia on January 30, 1942, the College Art Association of America was admitted to representation in the American Council of Learned Societies. This entails no change in policy of the College Art Association. It recognizes, rather, the serious interest of the Association in educational problems as well as in research.

At present both aspects of this interest are represented in the publications of the Association. *The Art Bulletin* has long been recognized as a leading periodical in the field of scholarly research. It receives the support of numerous institutions as well as the unsolicited contributions of scholars. The COLLEGE ART JOURNAL, on the other hand, is still in an experimental phase. As has been previously stated in these pages, its purpose is to encourage and to promote discussion of problems relating to the teaching of art at a college level, whether it be in creative or studio courses, or in the history of art. This purpose can be achieved only if the members interested in these problems will contribute articles for this periodical.

The financial condition of the College Art Association does not permit the publication of an illustrated magazine. Furthermore, the present crisis is not the time for expensive luxuries. If institutions and individuals throughout the country feel that the JOURNAL should be less modest, financial contributions might be made specifically toward the publication of the JOURNAL as is done for *The Art Bulletin*.

In view of the criticism, voiced by a few at the members' meeting, that the "practical" aspects of art education are neglected by the JOURNAL and by the Directors of the Association, it is again repeated that the JOURNAL stands ready to receive and to act upon articles or letters on any subject pertinent to the teaching of art in colleges. When, therefore, members are vitally interested in problems concerned primarily with art instruction rather than with scholarship, it is their duty to present their ideas and to make known their position. The editors of the JOURNAL hope to make it an organ for all members of the Association while excluding propaganda for any one point of view. Such a policy requires that members accept the responsibility of formulating and presenting their points of view so that the activities of the Association may include their own interests. The Directors will welcome any constructive suggestions that will enable them to increase the usefulness of the Association in its function as a national organization.—S. McK. C.

COLLEGE ART ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

DIRECTORS

President: SUMNER MCK. CROSBY, *Yale University*

Vice-President: MYRTILLA AVERY, *New York City*

Secretary: WALTER W. S. COOK, *New York University*

Treasurer: MARK EISNER, *New York City*

JOHN ALFORD
University of Toronto

ERWIN PANOFSKY
Institute for Advanced Study

RENSSELAER W. LEE
Smith College

AGNES RINDGE
Vassar College

SIRARPIE DER NERSESSIAN
Wellesley College

DAVID M. ROBINSON
The Johns Hopkins University

WILHELM R. W. KOEHLER
Harvard University

CHARLES SEYMOUR, JR.
National Gallery of Art

MARION LAWRENCE
Barnard College

JOSEPH C. SLOANE, JR.
Bryn Mawr College

MILLARD MEISS
Columbia University

ULRICH MIDDLEDORF
University of Chicago

E. BALDWIN SMITH
Princeton University

GRACE MCCANN MORLEY
San Francisco Museum

WOLFGANG STECHOW
Oberlin College

PUBLICATIONS

THE ART BULLETIN

Ten Dollars a Year; Single Numbers, Three Dollars.

COLLEGE ART JOURNAL

One Dollar a Year; Single Numbers, Twenty-Five Cents.

Subscriptions should be sent to the College Art Association of America,
625 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

All members of the Association receive both publications.